Jay Rivera 07/28/2022

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN CORPUS CHRIS			<u> </u>	TEXAS	,	
MODA INGLESIDE OIL TERMINAL, LLC, Plaintiff,	)	C.A. Admir Fed.	ralt	У		
V.	)	rca.	1.	CIV.		J (11)
M/T RIVERSIDE, its engines, tackle, etc., in rem, M/T NORDIC AQUARIUS, its engines, tackle, etc., in rem, et al.,  Defendants.	) ) ) )					

VIDEOTAPED ORAL DEPOSITION OF

CAPTAIN JAY RIVERA-BENAVENT

July 28, 2022

VIDEOTAPED ORAL DEPOSITION of CAPTAIN JAY
RIVERA-BENAVENT, produced as a witness at the
instance of the Defendant, M/T RIVERSIDE, and duly
sworn, was taken in the above-styled and numbered
cause on the 28th day of July, 2022, from 9:58 a.m.
to 3:11 p.m., before SHIRLEY J. MORRISON, CSR in and
for the State of Texas, at the Law Offices of
Royston, Rayzor, Vickery & Williams, LLP, 802 N.
Carancahua, Suite 1300, Corpus Christi, Nueces
County, Texas, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil
Procedure.

```
by, I believe, your expert and the NORDIC AQUARIUS
 1
    experts. I have also reviewed the report of
 2
 3
    Mr. Higgins that was an engine expert on the -- on
    the MODA side. And -- I believe that's it.
 5
    don't -- I don't think there's any other documents
    that I've reviewed since.
 6
 7
         Q.
              Okay.
              But none of those documents have changed my
 8
         Α.
    opinions.
 9
              Okay. Or conclusions?
10
         0.
              Or conclusions.
11
         Α.
12
              Okay. Opinions and conclusions are pretty
13
    much the same thing?
14
         Α.
              It depends.
                            Some -- sometimes they're
15
    restated in a more conclusive manner, but --
16
         Ο.
              Okay.
17
         Α.
              -- but they are generally --
18
              Synonymous?
         Q.
19
         Α.
              Yes.
2.0
         Q.
              Okay. Okay. So you don't have anything,
    as you sit here today, to add or revise in terms of
2.1
    your opinions or your conclusions --
22
23
         Α.
              No.
2.4
              -- to your report?
         Ο.
25
         Α.
              No.
```

Q. Okay. Were any of the inland rules of the 1 2 road violated by either of the vessels in relation to 3 this matter that led or contributed to the incident occurring? 4 5 Α. So I haven't -- I did not include that in my report. 6 If you did, would you have anything to add 7 or include? 8 I would say that -- that -- that to a -- to 9 a degree, there was -- Rule 9 was not followed. 10 And Rule 9 --11 Q. 12 The narrow-channel rule. Α. 13 -- in layman's terms says what? Ο. 14 Α. It says that a vessel -- well, I don't have the book in front of me. 15 16 0. You don't have to quote it --17 Α. Okay. 18 -- but what is it generally? What's the substance of it? 19 2.0 Generally, a vessel that's proceeding through a narrow channel and can only safely proceed 2.1 down that narrow channel, its passage must not be 22 23 interrupted or impeded. 2.4 Okay. And is that vessel who's proceeding Ο.

down the narrow channel the RIVERSIDE?

25

- Α. Correct. 1 And was it impeded in this case? 2 3 her -- her transit impeded in this case? It's my opinion that the RIVERSIDE had to 4 5 take action to avoid a collision with -- with the -with the NORDIC AQUARIUS by reducing its speed. 6 also my opinion that other measures could have been done in order to do that that not necessarily are 8 stopping the engine. But because of the NORDIC 9 AQUARIUS maneuvering ahead of the RIVERSIDE into the 10 11 navigation channel, the RIVERSIDE experienced, in 12 addition to the engine not starting, the allision. 13 Ο. So do you agree with this statement Okay. 14 that but for the NORDIC AQUARIUS's basically pulling out into the channel ahead of the RIVERSIDE vessel, 15 16 that the RIVERSIDE vessel wouldn't have had to have
  - out into the channel ahead of the RIVERSIDE vessel, that the RIVERSIDE vessel wouldn't have had to have given the stop engine order, thus setting off a chain of events that ultimately concluded with the allusion?
    - A. I would -- I would -
      MR. BAILEY: Object to form.

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

A. I would say that but for the NORDIC AQUARIUS departing ahead of the RIVERSIDE, it is highly likely, very highly likely that this incident would not have happened. The RIVERSIDE actually --

1 A. Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

Q. Okay. I know this was touched upon with Ms. Pettus, and I want to drill down on it a little bit more. She had originally asked you whether the report contained all of your opinions in this case, and then you said yes. And then it was, "Well, okay,

And it's like, "Oh, yes I do, and there's a Rule 9 violation." You don't even mention Rule 9 anywhere in the four corners -- within the four corners of your report. Correct?

but do you have any other opinions?"

- A. I do not, and I made that very clear when I was answering Ms. Pettus's question.
- Q. Right. So that would be a new opinion that we're hearing for the first time today in terms of your opinion that there was a Rule 9 violation in this case?
- A. I -- insofar as my report goes on the four corners of the report, I have not issued any other opinions. However, in -- in the deposition I was asked how Rule 9 would apply to this, and I answered.

MR. BAILEY: Okay. I'll object to the nonresponsive portion.

Q. (By Mr. Bailey) At the time that you drafted your report, did you feel like you had all

- 1 the information that you needed to put -- to give 2 your opinions in this case?
  - A. Yes.

3

9

10

11

- Q. Okay. Is there any information that you asked for but were not provided in -- in the preparation of your report and the preparation of your opinions?
- 8 A. I -- I don't believe so, no.
  - Q. Okay. Was there anything that you asked to do but were not permitted to do in preparing your analysis and your report?
- 12 A. No.
- Q. And I'm confident Ms. Pettus asked you this as well. Well, you reviewed some additional material since the preparation of your report, but they don't alter any of the opinions contained in your report.

  Correct?
- 18 A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. Is it your intention to testify live at trial if this case does go to trial?
- A. If it does go to trial and I'm asked to testify, yes.
- Q. Okay. And if you testify at trial or actually even here, I mean, if the judge -- you know, if you don't and, you know, the judge is looking at

your deposition testimony, the judge is going to be 1 the fact finder in this case. There's -- there's no 2 jury, but the judge is the fact finder. You want him 3 to believe that -- that you're being truthful in this 5 case and in your testimony. Correct? Α. Correct. 6 All right. And you want the judge to 7 8 believe that, as an expert, you're impartial or looking at things impartially --9 Α. Yes. 10 11 Ο. -- true? Okay. In other words, you don't 12 view your role as an expert on behalf of the plaintiff, MODA, as, you know, giving you the license 13 to embellish -- embellish facts in their favor? 14 I don't believe that that is the case at 15 16 all in -- in -- in this. 17 Okay. And -- and certainly you don't view Ο. your role to, you know, to exaggerate facts that 18 would assist them in -- in proving up their 19 2.0 allegations in this case. Correct? Actually, I believe that -- that my 2.1 particular expertise in this area is -- is very 22 valuable to the trier of fact. 23 2.4 MR. BAILEY: Okay. I'll object to the 25 nonresponsive portion.

```
1
              IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
               FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
                   CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION
 3
    MODA INGLESIDE OIL
    TERMINAL, LLC,
                                     C.A. NO. 2:21-CV-39
              Plaintiff,
                                     Admiralty
 4
                                     Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(h)
 5
    V.
 6
    M/T RIVERSIDE, its engines,)
    tackle, etc., in rem,
    M/T NORDIC AQUARIUS, its
    engines, tackle, etc.,
 8
    in rem, et al.,
              Defendants.
 9
                   REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION
10
          DEPOSITION OF CAPTAIN JAY RIVERA-BENAVENT
11
                         July 28, 2022
12
13
         I, SHIRLEY J. MORRISON, Certified Shorthand
14
    Reporter in and for the State of Texas, hereby
    certify to the following:
15
         That the witness, CAPTAIN JAY RIVERA-BENAVENT,
16
17
    was duly sworn by me and that the transcript of the
18
    oral deposition is a true record of the testimony
    given by the witness.
19
20
         I further certify that review and signature of
    the deponent was requested by the deponent or a party
21
22
    before the completion of the deposition.
         I further certify that I am neither attorney or
23
    counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of the
24
25
    parties to the action in which this testimony is
```

taken. Further, I am not a relative or employee of 1 2 any attorney of record in this cause, nor do I have a financial interest in the action. 3 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to on this the 9th day of 4 5 August, 2022. 6 7 SHIRLEY J. MORRISON, Texas CSR 1057 Expiration Date: 4/30/2023 8 Coastal Bend Video & Reporting 9 Firm Registration No. 10694 711 N. Carancahua, Suite 325 10 Corpus Christi, Texas 78401 (361) 888-7585 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25